



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/844,175	04/27/2001	Warren M. Farnworth	MI22-1703	4157

21567 7590 06/30/2004
WELLS ST. JOHN P.S.
601 W. FIRST AVENUE, SUITE 1300
SPOKANE, WA 99201

EXAMINER

KOBER, RUSSELL MARC

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2829

DATE MAILED: 06/30/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AA

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/844,175	Applicant(s) FARNWORTH ET AL.	
	Examiner Russell M Kobert	Art Unit 2829	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) Russell M Kobert. (3) _____
 (2) James D. Shaurette. (4) _____

Date of Interview: 16 June 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
 If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 31-42, 54-65, 67-70, 73 and 74.

Identification of prior art discussed: Akamine (5580827).


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


 Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicants' representative, Mr. Shaurette, initiated discussion of several issues. Mr. Shaurette argued that the specification clearly defines what a "knife-edge line" is, specifically at page 9, lines 11-13. However, the Examiner argued how a "knife-edge line" cannot be an apex having respective tips and bases as Applicants insist because a "knife-edge line" is a line and a line geometrically is a one-dimensional object whereas an apex geometrically is a two-dimensional object. Upon further discussion, Mr. Shaurette noted that the definitions and geometrical relationships, with respect to Figures 5 and 6 in the specification, with respect to each one of these terms will be better explained in the forthcoming amendment. Mr. Shaurette further discussed the merits of the claimed subject matter with respect to the art of record; specifically Akamine. Mr. Shaurette argued that Akamine is directed to a scanning probe microscope and not a probe structure as claimed by Applicants. Respectfully, Mr. Shaurette was directed to the disclosure of Akamine that describes multiple uses of microminature tips, not limited to a scanning probe microscope, for the apparatus of Akamine; specifically the use as a mechanical probe to focus current to a point (col 1, line 35-36). Mr. Shaurette also argued how an engagement probe comprising bulk semiconductor substrate (claim 38) is different from the probe of Akamine. Applicants contend that Akamine is not comprised of bulk semiconductor substrate. No agreement was reached on whether or not Akamine is comprised of bulk semiconductor substrate. Mr. Shaurette stated that in the response to follow, an explanation of the meaning of bulk semiconductor substrate will be provided including how it differs from the apparatus of Akamine. Other issues with respect to the rejections under 35 USC 112 and 35 USC 102 will also be addressed in the forthcoming amendment.